

## REMARKS

The present amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action dated December 11, 2006, which set a three-month period for response, making this amendment due by March 11, 2007.

Claims 1-5 and 7-14 are pending in this application.

In the Office Action, the listing of references cited in the specification was objected to as not a proper information disclosure statement. The Applicants were requested to submit an IDS. The drawings were objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) as not showing every feature the invention specified in the claims, specifically, the inner wall in claim 11. The abstract was objected to for an informality. Claims 1, 6, 10, 11 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,828,147 to Best et al. Claims 1, 6-8, 10, and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,900,687 to Kondo et al. Claims 1, 2, 9, and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,600,244 to Okazaki et al.

The Applicants note with appreciation the allowance of claims 3-5 if rewritten in independent form to include the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In the present amendment, the specification was amended to add standard sectional headings, to delete reference to the claims, and to add a

cross reference to the related priority document. The abstract was amended to address the objection.

Fig. 1 was amended to show the “inner wall 40” of the stator body. Likewise, the specification was amended to provide on pages 4-5 to provide the disclosed “inner wall” with reference numeral 40. The Applicants submit that no new matter was added, since the inner wall was described and shown in the application as originally filed.

Turning now to the substantive rejections of the claims, claim 1 has been amended to more clearly define the present invention over the cited references. Specifically, claim 1 now includes the features of claim 6, relating to the bent segments 35, but define more clearly that these bent segments are formed as closed wire loops, as clearly shown in Figs. 2 and 3.

Amended claim 1 also incorporates features disclosed on page 3, line 2 of the specification, specifically, that the “wires have a round cross section” and that the “wires are formed by means of a wire-bending process” (specification, page 3, line 8). In Figs. 2 and 3 it can be seen that the bent segments 35 are formed as a continual progression of the wire.

In the cited patent to Best, stamped parts are used as “electrical connecting leads (12), as can be seen in Fig. 1 in rectangular cross section in connection with Fig. 7 by the formation of the hooks 13a. Likewise, the patent to Okazaki discloses the use of stamped elements, as can be seen on the conductive strips in 6a through 9a in Fig. 6 in connection with the projections 6b through 9b in Fig. 9.

The core of the present invention, in contrast, is that no stamped parts are used for the electrical conducting strips, as discussed in the present application on pages 1 and 2 with regard to the state of the art, such as EP 1 062 720 B1. On page 2 of the present application, it is against stated that with the bending of the wires according to the present invention, a drastic reduction in the material costs occurs, and that the bending tools for the wire bending process are much less expensive then stamping tools.

The amendments to claim 1 emphasize this distinction. The formation of the bent segments as closed loops by wire bending offers the additional advantage that the conductive strips can be bent as one piece without cutting from a wire.

Amended claim 1 also defines over the Kondo reference, which shows wires with a round cross section (3a through 5a), but which does not show bending of the wire as closed wire loops in the sense of the present invention. For example, in Figs. 6 and 7, it is shown that multiple wires are combined and by means of a connection element 9, are connected with a further wire end of the coil. This structure made of multiple wire ends, however, contradicts the claimed subject matter of the present invention, which is forming the conductive strips by continuous bent wires with closed conductive loops as bent segments.

Because none of the cited references discloses all of the features of amended claim 1, the rejections under Section 102 must be withdrawn. According to MPEP section 2131, to anticipate a claim a reference must teach

every element of the claim in as complete detail as is contained in Applicant's claim.

Also in this amendment, new dependent claim 14 has been added. New claim 14 depends on claim 5 and defines further that the "upper channel (23) and the lower channel (26) are axially offset in relation to the channels (24, 25) in a common middle plane of the support (20)". Support for this language can be found in the specification on page 4, lines 20-22.

For the reasons set forth above, the Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-5 and 7-14 are patentable over the cited art. The Applicants further request withdrawal of the rejections and reconsideration of the claims as herein amended.

The Examiner has indicated that the Information Disclosure Statement previously filed is not proper because "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." The Examiner has indicated that unless the references have been cited by the Examiner, they have not been considered.

Thus, it is believed that the Information Disclosure Statement is proper. The list for the Information Disclosure Statement was not set forth in the Specification, but was clearly set forth in a PTO Form 1449 attached to the Information Disclosure Statement.

The Manual of Patent Examining Procedure clearly states that the relevancy of a document in a foreign language may be indicated by reference to the explanation set forth in the specification. Additionally, it is noted that the

Examiner did sign and initial the Information Disclosure Statement. Therefore, in the absence of information to the contrary, it is assumed that the Information Disclosure Statement has been fully considered.

Should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, the undersigned would very much welcome a telephone call in order to discuss appropriate claim language that will place the application into condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

**/ Michael J. Striker /**

Michael J. Striker  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No.: 27233  
103 East Neck Road  
Huntington, New York 11743  
631-549-4700